

**Debbie Beadle**

---

**From:** Linda Eastlick <lmeastlick@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 18, 2012 11:53 AM  
**To:** ECA  
**Subject:** BAS review and applicability

Respected Commissioners,

I am writing in reference, once more, to the BAS review and the applicability of same to the ECA code. My apologies if I am restating concerns already mentioned, I have been unable to participate in the ECA update process at the level I would have liked and, thus have not been able to read through all of the documents.

As I understand the BAS review, the consultants have addressed only changes in the literature since the last BAS review. I do not have a clear understanding of whether they have looked at the continued applicability of the recommendations from the last BAS review, which is the basis for my following comment.

My hope is that the commission is evaluating the original science and BAS recommendations when determining proposed code changes. How, specifically, do the studies support the recommendations? And, do the studies truly support the recommendations? Where was/is extrapolation from test conditions being made and is that extrapolation sound? Bottom line, were the studies cited in the original BAS review relevant to existing conditions in Sammamish?

Thank you for all the time, effort, and hard work you are putting in to update this code. Thank you, also, for your concerted efforts to improve citizen involvement in this process and to hear what citizens have to contribute.

Regards,

Linda Eastlick

EXHIBIT NO. 176

## Debbie Beadle

---

**From:** Marilyn Favre <marilyn.favre@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 18, 2012 11:54 AM  
**To:** Debbie Beadle  
**Subject:** ECA Process Major and Minor Concerns

EXHIBIT NO.

177

Dear Debbie Beadle, Evan Maxim, Kathy Richardson, Michael Luxenberg, Joe Lipinsky, Mike Collins, Mahbubul Islam, Jeff Wasserman and Ryan Kohlmann,

I am writing in regards to the ECA Process Major and Minor Items agenda. First, I wish to thank all of you for the time and dedication you are devoting to this important process. realize the complexity of the issues you will be discussing and appreciate your willingness to serve. There is an abundance of information and testimony that requires careful analysis and discernment before any recommendations can be made to the City Council.

In order to not deluge you with more reading material I would like to say that I agree with all of Barbara Raabe's recommendations to you, as per her July 12, 2012 letter to you in reference to the ECA Process Major and Minor agenda items.

In addition to those I would also like to request that item 2-1 under the Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas be added to the list of Major items. The animals on the plateau were all part of an interdependent ecosystem long before any development occurred in Sammamish thus this delicate ecosystem should not be disturbed. We should not be deciding which animals should stay and which should go. It's on this basis that I recommend that the clause in 2-1, "after the city has determined the needs of the species it most wants to protect" be deleted or moved to the Parking lot items.

In reference to 2-2 I recommend this be moved to major items. A definite plan needs to be enacted to increase buffer zones for wildlife corridors and protective measures increased so that the animals will have some sanctuaries of natural habitat where they are free to survive and thrive. This is vital as the availability of open spaces on the diminishes due to high impact urban development. Space needs to be set aside in those areas, not already constrained by existing development before it is entirely too late. Please review AMEC Best Available Science Streams, Fish and Wildlife Report and review oral public comment given by Geoffrey Creighton on March 15, 2012 in your analysis.

I also request that item 4.1 listed under Minor items be moved to Major. Due to landslides cited in Barbara Raabe's letter after major weather events which have often jeopardized the safety of citizens, cost the city/taxpayers large sums of money to remedy I request that this be moved to Major. I feel building variances should require the utmost scrutiny or even not be allowed on these hazardous properties during the wet season. Additional steep slope/hillside and other densely forested properties also need to be included in this analysis. I would like to specifically cite the picture attached to the letter sent to the PC on July 6, 2012 be taken into consideration when analyzing the significance of 4.1 and all of it's ramifications. How has "fully mitigated" been defined, determined and regulated in the past and what were the results? This all needs to be delineated clearly.

Once again thank you for your service to the community and for your consideration of these changes to the ECA Major and Minor Items agenda.

Respectfully yours,

Marilyn Favre  
936 212th AVE NE  
Sammamish, WA 98074-6719

[marilyn.favre@hotmail.com](mailto:marilyn.favre@hotmail.com)

## Debbie Beadle

---

**From:** Geoffrey M Creighton <gmc13@earthlink.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 18, 2012 1:31 PM  
**To:** Debbie Beadle  
**Subject:** ECA Process Major and Minor Concerns memorandum dated 2012.07.06

Dear members of the Sammamish Planning Commission:

I am writing to echo and supplement the comments of Marilyn Favre (email dated 2012.07.18) and Barbara Raabe (letter of 2012.07.12) regarding the ECA Process Major and Minor Items memorandum (<https://www.ci.sammamish.wa.us/files/document/9684.pdf>).

### **"Major Policy Recommendations"**

- Several have noted the shortcomings of the "best available science" as presented; in particular, many of the conclusions rest on old information that has not been updated or verified. For example, presentations routinely referred to "wildlife corridors", yet these are based on old and inadequate mappings. Similarly, "density" analyses were based on zoning maps received from King County without regard to whether an "R-6" density on a map was actually still undeveloped forest-land. (By way of example, a woefully inadequate "wildlife habitat" report was prepared recently in connection with the proposed Benham Ridge development; citing the King County iMap and Environmentally Sensitive Areas map as evidence, it concluded that "there are no wildlife corridors within 6600 feet of the property. No wildlife corridors within a mile of Inglewood Hill/212<sup>th</sup>? That's what the map says, but it ain't so. The recent BAS work relied, similarly, on mappings and data that were not adequately examined for accuracy or completeness.) In order to qualify as "best available science" the science must rely on valid data, not on unexamined received wisdom.
- In 2-8 and 3-3, the recommendation for a "fee-in-lieu" mitigation approach suggests that money can buy irreplaceable wilderness. This is profoundly questionable. If implemented, clear controls and strict criteria would be necessary. Otherwise, Sammamish would be providing developers with a cash-based solution that could permanently compromise the local ecosystem.
- In 3-21, the use of wetlands for stormwater management ignores the often-delicate balance of the wetland environment. Flooding and draining marsh-land, for example, substantially alters the nature of the land and is damaging to species that rely on shallow waters or waters-edge environments for survival. A wetland is not a storm drain.

### **"Minor Items Recommended for Approval"**

- In 2-1 and 2-2, I concur in Ms. Favre's view that Fish & Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas should be added to the list of Major Policy Recommendations.
- 2-1 should, however, first be amended: It's unclear what is meant by "the species [the City] most wants to protect". Does the City "want to protect" the black bears that wander up and down the George Davis Creek? Do we vote the pigeons in and the coyotes out? It's odd to imagine the City choosing – by what criteria? – which wildlife to keep and which to kill.

### **"Planning Commission Success Statement"**

The current “success statement” speaks about the process but lacks any vision for adherence to existing Sammamish Plan documents. For example:

- The Comprehensive Plan says we are to “Protect and enhance streams, wetlands and wildlife corridors” and “preserve trees and green ways by encouraging the preservation or development of large areas of greenery”.
- The Final Basin Plan for Inglewood Basin says a #1 Goal is to “Improve fish and wildlife habitat”.
- The Sustainability Strategy says “Citizens want to protect and create natural habitat by maintaining and improving green space, as well as fish and wildlife habitat. Habitat protection focuses on preserving high quality habitat within the City.”

These ought to be central to the Planning Commission’s success criteria.

Thanks.

Geoffrey Creighton  
21407 NE 6<sup>th</sup> PL  
Sammamish, WA 98074-3902  
[gmc13@earthlink.net](mailto:gmc13@earthlink.net)